



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO | D | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/848,967 | 848,967 05/04/2001 | | Emanuel Calenoff | 21417/92378 | 6936 |
| 23644 | 7590 | 08/25/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| BARNES | & THOR | NBURG | CHEU, CHANGHWA J | | |
| P.O. BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 1641 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/848,967 | CALENOFF ET AL. | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Jacob Cheu | 1641 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply to a | | | | | |
| | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The deep the seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFF of extension and the corresponding amount in the shortened statutory period for reply of the shortened statutory period for the shortened statutory period for the shortened statutory period for reply of the shortened statutory period for the shortened stat | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | | | |
| timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Cl | FR 1.704(b). | ing date of the final rejection, even if | | | | | |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | | | | | | | |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furthe | r consideration and/or search (s | ee NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | better form for appeal by mater | ially reducing or simplifying the | | | | | |
| (d) 🔲 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: Claim scope is different, possible new 112 | 2, first and second paragraph issue | <u>·s</u> . | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | on(s): | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | — 31 1 and the same of the sam | | | | | | |
| The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims would be appeared by the proposed amendment (sexplanation). | s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)[uld be rejected is provided belov | ☐ will be entered and an wor appended. | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: None. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,17-19,21 and 22</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appro | oved or b) disapproved by the | e Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | | | | | | | |
| 0. Other: | | BAO-THUY L. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER 823/04 | | | | | |
| | | ' | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration filed by Dr. Anderson on July 16, 2004 has been received, entered, and considered. However, the arguments presented are not persuasive because mimotope is a peptide capable of inducing immunoresponse, and selection of phage peptide library is a process of "derived" or "obtained" from the target protein (See page 334, right column, third paragraph). Furthermore, Dr. Anderson acknowledges that the non-target protein (comparative proteins) are from "all other known protein sequence" (See Declaration, page 5, third paragraph). It is inherent that all other known proteins besides the target protein are potential non-target protein candidates. Accordingly, the prior art would still render the instant invention anticipated. With respect to the argument of Attorney Ms. Martin, the previous Office Action has inidicated the target protein (HbsAg), the selected peptide (Mimotope 13), the non-target protein (HCV) and all the recited features in the art. The amendments are sti within the anticipated teachings. Furthermore, the comparative protein (non-target protein) are derived by "all available sequence matche in the computer data banks (See page 3, line 23-28). Thus the selected peptide is virtually covered by "all other knonw protein" since the criteria feature set forth "an amino acid net sequence homology of 50 percent or less compared with amino acid sequence of a comparative protein" (See claim 1(c)).